

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are pending in this application, of which claim 1 has been amended.

No new claims have been added.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Shimazaki (previously applied) in view of U.S. Patent 6,178,514 to Wood (hereinafter "Wood").

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner has reasserted that Shimazaki inherently discloses an internal power source, or battery, that has a D.C. voltage less than a D.C. voltage provided by the external power source.

In Applicant's response of December 30, 2003, we argued the following:

In Shimazaki, the Examiner has compared the 120 Volts AC external power source to the 3.7 Volts DC internal power source. This is in contrast to the present invention in which the external power source voltage V_{DD} of 5 Volts D.C. (regulated to 3.3 volts D.C.) is compared to the 2.8 Volts D.C. internal power source voltage powered by a battery.

Accordingly, in that response claim 1 was amended to recite that the internal power source has a D.C. voltage less than the D.C. voltage provided by the external source.

In response to this argument, the Examiner urged in the Office Action mailed March 3, 2004:

Shimazaki does implicitly disclose the internal power source being lower in voltage than the external power source. Shimazaki discloses the internal power source being a battery (col. 4, lines 45-50) and the external power source being an electrical outlet (col. 3,

lines 16-18). Inherently it is known the external power source is 120 Volts AC, and the internal power source is much lower than that (usually around 3.7 Volts). It is commonly known that the power supply of laptop converts the 120 Volts AC to a DC voltage usually around 20.5 Volts DC (see Potega U.S. Patent 6,459,175, col. 13, lines 10-18). Therefore, Shimazaki implicitly discloses the internal power source being lower in voltage than the external power source.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Despite the Examiner's assertions, Shimazaki does not disclose any internal battery voltage level, although it is well known that it is less than 120 Volts. However, the 120 Volts of the external source is AC and must be converted to a lower D.C. voltage level before reaching the circuitry of the laptop. U.S. Patent 6,459,175 to Potega suggests that this lower D.C. voltage may be 20.5 Volts D.C. However, neither reference discloses the relationship of the level of the AC-to-DC converted voltage to the internal battery voltage. Thus, Shimazaki does not disclose an internal power source which has a D.C. voltage less than a D.C. voltage provided by the external power source, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Wood has been cited for disclosing "a laptop's external power connected to a USB connector to power the device".

In an interview conducted with the Examiner on November 29, 2004, the Examiner indicated that an amendment to claim 1 limiting the external D.C. power source voltage to no more than 5 volts would place the claims in condition for allowance over the prior art of record.

Accordingly, claim 1 has been so amended, and the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Shimazaki and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,764,502 to Morgan et al. (hereinafter "Morgan et al.").

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Morgan et al. has been cited for teaching power supply wires having a reverse flow resist means (presumably, blocking diode 150 which prevents reverse flow of D.C. current).

Morgan et al., like the other cited references, fails to teach, mention or suggest the limitations recited in the proposed amendment to claim 1, from which claim 5 depends.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-2 and 4-5, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/745,667
Response to Office Action dated September 8, 2004

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla
Atty. Docket No. 001716
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE